



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/712,374	03/01/2007	Junichi Rekimoto	1946-0256	8189

142241 7590 01/30/2017
Paratus Law Group, PLLC
1765 Greensboro Station Place
Suite 320
Tysons Corner, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ROLAND, GRISELLE CORBO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2158

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/30/2017

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte JUNICHI REKIMOTO

Appeal 2016-000555
Application 11/712,374
Technology Center 2100

Before CARLA M. KRIVAK, KEVIN C. TROCK, and
MICHAEL J. ENGLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KRIVAK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1–9 and 11–20. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant's invention is directed to "an information processing apparatus, an information processing system, an information processing method, and a computer program that realize improvement of usability of tags that can be set in association with resources on a network" (Spec. 1:10–17).

Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is exemplary of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A client apparatus comprising:
 - a user interface serving as a data input/output unit;
 - a communicating unit that executes data communication;
 - and
 - a data processing unit, executing on a computer processor, configured to:
 - browse a Web page and register a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) of the Web page as a bookmark, the bookmark stored on an information sharing server with a plurality of bookmarks, wherein the bookmark includes an extended tag for indexing the bookmark with an attribute name and an attribute value,
 - set the attribute name,
 - transmit the attribute name via the communication unit to the information sharing server,
 - receive data associated with a function associated with the attribute name from the information sharing server via the communication unit, wherein the function is selected by the information sharing server according to the attribute name transmitted by the client apparatus,
 - output an execution result of the function to the user interface for display based on the transmitted attribute name,
 - identify a user input received when the user interface displays the execution result of the function; and
 - set the attribute value according to the identified user input and the transmitted attribute name.

REFERENCES and REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1–9 and 11–20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the teachings of Duri (US 2002/0156832 A1, published Oct. 24, 2002) and Hegedus (US 2004/0030490 A1, published Feb. 12, 2004).

ANALYSIS

Appellant contends the Examiner erred in finding Duri discloses all the claim limitations except for explicitly disclosing setting the attribute name, transmitting the attribute name, receiving data associated with a function associated with the attribute name, outputting an execution result of the function, identifying a user input, and setting the attribute value according to the identified user input and transmitted attribute name (App. Br. 17; Final Act. 5). Appellant further contends Hegedus does not cure the deficiencies of Duri as the Examiner asserts (Final Act. 5–7). Particularly, Appellant contends Hegedus does not teach or suggest “a user interface that prompts a user to input an attribute value after receiving data associated with the previously submitted attribute name” (App. Br. 18). We do not agree.

We agree with and adopt the Examiner’s findings as our own (Final Act. 4–7; Ans. 2–4). Initially, we note Appellant’s Appeal Brief recites the paragraphs of Hegedus the Examiner relied on and then states Hegedus does not teach or suggest “a user interface that prompts a user to input an attribute value after receiving data associated with the previously submitted attribute name” (*see* App. Br. 18, 19, 20, 21, 23). However, as the Examiner finds, this language/limitation is not found in the claims (Ans. 2). Appellant’s Reply Brief provides additional explanation, which were waived because

Appellant could have provided such explanation in the Appeal Brief but chose not to. Moreover, Appellant's argument does not persuade us the Examiner erred as the claim recites "identify a user input" and "set the attribute value according to the identified user input" and the attribute value is part of the extended tag for indexing a bookmark of the URL (*see, e.g.*, claim 1).

Appellant further asserts "the claims clearly differentiate between an 'attribute name' and an 'attribute value'" (App. Br. 25–26). We do not agree with Appellant's application of these terms. The claim merely recites "the bookmark includes an extended tag for indexing the bookmark with an attribute name and an attribute value." Further, as the Examiner finds, there is no definition for either of these terms in Appellant's Specification (Ans. 3–4). We agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the term "attribute name" as meaning "a string that identifies an attribute" as it identifies a type of location associated with a keyword (Ans. 3). The selected type of category is then sent to a server which returns a list of possible values (attribute value) associated with the selected category which a user may chose. This is taught by Hegedus (*id.*).

Thus, in light of the broad terms recited in the claims and the arguments presented, Appellant has failed to distinguish clearly the claimed invention over the prior art relied on by the Examiner. We find the weight of the evidence supports the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion of obviousness, and therefore sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1–9 and 11–20.

DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1–9 and 11–20 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED